

19.06.2026
Court No.35.
D/L.16.
Rakib
(Rejected)

CRM (M) 2294 of 2025
With
CRAN 1 of 2026

In Re: An Application for Bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/Under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Bidhannagar Cyber Crime Police Station case no. 139 of 2024 dated June 24, 2024 under Sections 419/420/406/120B and added Section 467 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

And

In the matter of : Jimi Agarwal.

.....Petitioner.

Mr. Ayan Bhattacharjee, Sr. Adv,
Mr. Satadru Lahiri
Mr. Soumya Basu Roy Chowdhury
Ms. Minal Palana
Mr. Rohit Agarwal

.....for the Petitioner.

Ms. Arushi Rathore

.....for the State.

Mr. Dipanjan Chatterjee
Mr. Prateep Bera
Ms. Kakan Das
Ms. Rimpa Adhikary

.....for the de-facto complainant.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that petitioner is carrying on a retail business and is innocent of the charges. He has been falsely implicated in connection with the instant case. Petitioner has been struggling for livelihood and the police authorities without any materials have falsely implicated him in connection with the instant case. There are no iota of materials against the petitioner and there is no possibility of the trial concluding in near future.

On the other hand learned advocate appearing for the State submits that the subject matter of the instant case involves

deputing large number of persons where an amount of Rs.245/- crores are involved. So far as the present petitioner is concerned, the culpability of the petitioner surfaces from the issue relating to allowing the other individuals to create accounts in his office address as well as at his residential address. 25 accounts were opened in the office address of the present petitioner at Security House, so far as the residential address of the present petitioner where there are materials to show that the persons who opened the account they were staying at the residence of the present petitioner.

I have taken into account the submissions of the learned advocate appearing for the petitioner as well as that of the State. The complicity of the present petitioner cannot be lightly brushed aside. In view of the fact that the investigation revealing involvement of persons not only in India but also at foreign countries. The trial of the case is in progress. 6/7 witnesses have already been examined and the learned advocate for the State submits on instructions that 7 more witnesses are vulnerable witnesses and the prosecution intends to reduce the number of witnesses by way of examining 43 witnesses in support of this case. At this stage, I am of the opinion that the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

Petitioner will renew his prayer for bail at the appropriate stage.

Accordingly, CRM (M) 2294 of 2025 along with CRAN 1 of 2026 is **dismissed at this stage.**

All parties shall act in terms of server copy of the order downloaded from the official website of this Court.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)